

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 2 October 2008.
2. Claims 1, 3-20, 22-42, and 44-50 are pending. Claims 1, 20, and 39 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 12, 14, 20, 22-24, 28, 31, 33, 39, 44-46, and 48-50 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crozier (US 5701423, patented 23 December 1997) and further in view of Meltzer et al. (US 6125391, patented 26 September 2000, hereafter Meltzer).

As per independent claim 1, Crozier discloses a method of exchanging a document between at least two document management systems, comprising the steps of:

- Placing at least a first document in a first predetermined common serialized format at a first document management system to generate a first serialized document, the first predetermined serialized format including first document content and first property information (column 5, lines 1-33: Here, the data stored on the handheld computer is translated into common record structures (CRS).

Art Unit: 2178

CRS is the first serialized document format. Further, data transferred between devices is translated to a common format, a format that the device is capable of handling, prior to the data being transferred to the other device)

- Transferring the first serialized document from the first document management system to a second document management system (column 5, lines 18-33: Here, the CRS is transferred from the first document management system (DMS), the DMS of the handheld computer, through the DTCOMM to the desktop computer, utilizing a second DMS)
- Receiving the first serialized document in the first predetermined common serialized format at the second document management system (column 5, lines 1-33)
- Processing an unmatched portion of the first predetermined serialized format with respect to the second predetermined common serialized format to generate a resolved second serialized format, the second predetermined serialized format being unique to the second document management system and including second document content and second property information (column 11, line 62- column 12, line 8: Here, unmatched text data having the same field names is displayed to a user allowing the user to update, edit, or ignore the conflict. This inherently includes processing to determine that the portion is unmatched; column 10, line 66- column 11, line 12: Here, each handheld device has a unique first predetermined data format. Once this data is translated, via a rules engine, a second predetermined format, a desktop format, is created. This desktop format

is unique to the second document management system of the desktop, as the first document management system of the handheld is unable to process the data)

- Converting the first serialized document into the resolved second serialized format at the second document management system to generate a converted serialized document (column 5, lines 18-33: Here, the transferred data is converted from the first serialized document into a resolved second serialized document through mapping and further through the translation to formats accepted by the desktop applications)

Crozier fails to specifically disclose the use of translation tables for translating between formats. However, Meltzer disclose the use of translation tables to translate between data formats (Figures 14-15; column 84, lines 16-64: Here, a translation table facilitates the translation from a non-XML format to an XML format). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Meltzer with Crozier since it would have provided a concrete conversion template.

As per dependent claim 3, Crozier discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Crozier fails to specifically disclose adding a new piece of property information to the first property information, but instead discloses the ability to edit property information (column 11, line 62- column 12, line 8). It was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that editing included adding information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2178

skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have applied the common definition of editing to Crozier, since it would have allowed a user to add new property information, therefore allowing a user to avoid overwriting divergent data.

As per dependent claim 4, Crozier discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Crozier fails to specifically disclose deleting a new piece of property information to the first property information, but instead discloses the ability to edit property information (column 11, line 62- column 12, line 8). It was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that editing included deleting information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have applied the common definition of editing to Crozier, since it would have allowed a user to delete property information, therefore allowing a user to avoid overwriting divergent data.

As per dependent claim 5, Crozier discloses wherein the converting step further includes an additional step of converting a piece of the first property information to a corresponding piece of the second property information (column 5, lines 43-49).

As per dependent claim 9, Crozier discloses wherein the serialized document includes property information (column 11, line 62- column 12, line 8: Here, the serialized document includes key fields, which are property information for the data associated with the key field).

As per dependent claim 12, Crozier discloses wherein the second document management system includes a database manager while the first document

management system includes a file system for managing the first document in files and directories (column 5, lines 18-33).

As per dependent claim 14, Crozier discloses wherein the first document management system includes a database manager while the second document management system includes a file system for managing the first document in files and directories (column 5, lines 1-9 and 18-33: Here, the data is transferred from the handheld having files and directories to the desktop having a database management system. However, the transfer of data for conversion can go from the desktop (DMS) to handheld (files and directories)).

As per independent claims 20 and 39, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claims 20 and 39 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 22-23 and 44-45, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 3-4 respectively. Claims 22-23 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 24 and 46, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 5. Claims 24 and 46 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 28, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 9. Claim 28 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 31, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 12. Claim 31 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 33, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 14. Claim 33 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 48, Crozier discloses wherein the processing step ignores the unmatched portion of the first predetermined serialized format with respect to the second predetermined serialized format (column 11, line 62- column 12, line 8: Here, unmatched text data having the same field names is displayed to a user allowing the user to update, edit, or ignore the conflict. In this instance, if a user chooses to ignore the conflict, the unmatched portions are ignored).

As per dependent claim 49-50, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 48. Claims 49-50 are similarly rejected.

3. Claims 6, 8, 10, 13, 15-19, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34-37, 40-42, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crozier and Meltzer and further in view of WeissHaus et al. (GNU tar: an archiver tool, 1997, hereafter WeissHaus).

As per dependent claim 6, Crozier discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Crozier fails to specifically disclose the method of exchanging a document between at least two document management systems further comprising the steps of:

- Breaking the converted serialized document into a predetermined set of document units at the second document manager system
- Storing the document units at the second document management system

However, WeissHaus discloses the method of exchanging a document between at least two document management systems further comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2178

- Breaking the converted serialized document into a predetermined set of document units at the second document manager system
- Storing the document units at the second document management system
(Introduction, page 2, paragraph 2: Here, the first document is broken down into the predetermined set of original documents and stored at the second document manager system)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Weissshaus with Crozier, since it would have allowed a user to store the documents more efficiently.

As per dependent claim 8, Crozier discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Crozier fails to specifically disclose the method wherein the serialized document includes a plurality of documents.

Weissshaus further discloses the method wherein the serialized document includes a plurality of documents (Introduction, page 1, paragraph 9: Here, a tar archive is an archive of several documents/directories bundled together). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Weissshaus with Crozier, since it would have allowed a user to convert a plurality of documents simultaneously.

As per dependent claim 10, Crozier discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Crozier fails to specifically disclose the method wherein the property information includes information on a title, a creation date, an author, a version and a stream as elements, each of the elements

Art Unit: 2178

including a predetermined set of property values. Weisshaus further discloses the method wherein the property information includes information on a title, a creation date, an author, a version and a stream as elements, each of the elements including a predetermined set of property values (Introduction, page 1, paragraph 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Weisshaus with Crozier, since it would have allowed a user to maintain a metadata about a document.

As per dependent claim 13, Crozier discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Crozier fails to specifically disclose the method wherein the first document is represented by a predetermine set of the directories and files, the placing step further comprising an additional step of generating the serialized document based upon the directories and the files of the first document. Weisshaus further discloses the method wherein the first document is represented by a predetermine set of the directories and files, the placing step further comprising an additional step of generating the serialized document based upon the directories and the files of the first document (Introduction, page 1, paragraph 9- page 2, paragraph 2: Here, a serialized document (tar archive) is generated to contain files and directories. Further, extracting the serialized document (tar archive) maintains and builds the directory structure in the directory in which it is extracted). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Weisshaus with Crozier, since it would have allowed a user to transfer converted files and directories.

As per dependent claim 15, Crozier discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 14, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Crozier fails to specifically disclose the method wherein the converting step further comprising an additional step of generating the files and the directories based upon the serialized document to represent the first document in the second document management system. However, Weisshaus discloses the method wherein the converting step further comprising an additional step of generating the files and the directories based upon the serialized document to represent the first document in the second document management system (Introduction, page 1, paragraph 9- page 2, paragraph 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Weisshaus with Crozier, since it would have allowed a user to create the directory structure of the original document.

As per dependent claim 16, Crozier and Weisshaus disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 15, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Weisshaus discloses the method of exchanging a document between at least two document management systems wherein the first predetermined serialized format includes first document content and first property information, the second predetermined serialized format including second document content and second property information (Introduction, page 1, paragraph 9- page 2, paragraph 3: Here, the first format (archive format) has property information such as users and group, size in bytes, the files contained in a tar archive, and last modification time, while the members inside the tar file contain similar information, including file name). It would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 2178

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined WeissHaus with Crozier, since it would have allowed a user to create the directory structure of the original document.

As per dependent claims 17-18 and 36-37, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 3-4. Claims 17-18 and 36-37 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 19, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 5. Claim 19 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 25, 27, and 29, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 6, 8, and 10 respectively. Claims 25, 27, and 29 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 32 and 34-35, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 13 and 15-16 respectively. Claims 32 and 34-35 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 40, Crozier discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 39 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Crozier fails to specifically disclose wherein the serialized document is processed at a processing module to generate a processed document subsequent to the transferring task. WeissHaus further discloses the storage medium wherein the serialized document is processed at a processing module to generate a processed document subsequent to the transferring task (Introduction, page 1, paragraph 9; page 2, paragraph 7; page 3, paragraph 1: Here, creation of a serialized document (tar archive) is done independent of the step of

Art Unit: 2178

transferring the archive. Also, the transferring is directed to transfer of the serialized document (tar archive), therefore the serialized document (tar archive) must be created before being transferred). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Weissshaus with Crozier, since it would have allowed a user to save time by transferring a single item.

As per dependent claim 41, Crozier discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 39, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Crozier fails to specifically disclose wherein the serialized document is converted into files and directories prior to the transferring task and the files and directories are processed prior to the transferring task to generate a processed document. Weissshaus further discloses the storage medium, wherein the serialized document is converted into files and directories prior to the transferring task and the files and directories are processed prior to the transferring task to generate a processed document (Introduction, page 1, paragraph 9- page 3, paragraph 1: Here, files and directories are packaged into a serialized document (tar archive). This is then transferred over a network). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Weissshaus with Crozier, since it would have allowed a user to save time by transferring a single item.

As per dependent claim 42, Crozier and Weissshaus disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Weissshaus further discloses the storage medium, wherein the processed document is converted back to the serialized document in the first predetermined serialized format

Art Unit: 2178

(Introduction, page 1, paragraph 9- page 3, paragraph 1: Here, when the serialized format (tar archive) is unpacked, the original structure of the data in the first document is maintained. The directory structure and files in the serialized document (tar archive) are maintained and recreated on the second document management system). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Weissshaus with Crozier, since it would have allowed a user to obtain an original document for processing.

As per dependent claim 47, Crozier discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 39, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Crozier fails to specifically disclose wherein the serialized document is converted into files and directories prior to the transferring task and the files and the directories are processed at a remote location to generate a processed document, the processed document being converted back to the first predetermined serialized format and being transferred back to the first document management module. Weissshaus further discloses the storage medium wherein the serialized document is converted into files and directories prior to the transferring task and the files and the directories are processed at a remote location to generate a processed document, the processed document being converted back to the first predetermined serialized format and being transferred back to the first document management module (Introduction, page 1, paragraph 9- page 3, paragraph 1: Here, the serialized document (tar archive) containing directories and files can be created remotely and transferred over a network to a document management module). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to have combined Weissshaus with Crozier, since it would have allowed a user to obtain an original document for processing.

4. Claims 7, 11, 26, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crozier and Meltzer and further in view of The Hermit Hacker ("Re: [GENERAL] Restoring from a Unix Tar backup of data director...", pages 1-3, 1999, hereafter Hacker).

As per dependent claim 7, Crozier discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Crozier fails to specifically disclose the method wherein the first document management system and the second document management system is both a database manager. Hacker discloses the method wherein the first document management system and the second document management system are both a database manager (pages 1-3: Here, a database is used to create/extract and store tar archives). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Crozier with Hacker's method, since it would have allowed a user to more quickly search a network.

As per dependent claim 11, Crozier discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Crozier fails to disclose the method wherein the first document management system includes a first database managing the first document and the second document management system includes a second database manager for managing the converted serialized document. Hacker

Art Unit: 2178

discloses the method wherein the first document management system includes a first database managing the first document and the second document management system includes a second database manager for managing the converted serialized document (pages 1-3: Here, a database is used to create/extract and store tar archives). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Crozier with Hacker's method, since it would have allowed a user to more quickly search a network.

As per dependent claims 26 and 30, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 7 and 11 respectively. Claims 26 and 30 are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 2 October 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant's initial argument is based upon the belief that the prior art fails to teach a translation table (pages 14-17). Initially, the applicant points to the disclosure to state that a "serialized document is generated in a predetermined common format such as XML (page 15)." However, the examiner must point out, the claim language does not require the documents in the predetermined serialized format to be XML. Instead, the claim language merely requires a predetermined serialized format.

The applicant further discloses that Meltzer discloses translating non-XML data into XML data. This is accomplished by translation rules for translating an XML defining

Art Unit: 2178

DTD into Java beans for defining non-XML data (page 15). The applicant then alleges that although Meltzer discloses use of a translation table, Meltzer fails to disclose how the translation is performed (page 15). However, the applicant's claim language does not require a detailed description of how such a translation is performed. The claim language merely requires the use of a translation table. Further, Meltzer is only relied upon by the examiner to show that translations using translation tables were known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention. Therefore, the argument based upon the process by which Meltzer translates data via a translation table is non-persuasive.

The applicant further argues that Crozier fails to disclose a common record structure containing records and property information of the records (page 16). The examiner respectfully disagrees. Crozier discloses the records being stored in a plurality of applications, such as phone, schedule, todo, data, and memo (column 5, lines 18-21). Each record is associated with one of these programs and therefore has corresponding property information relating to the associated application. Therefore, this argument is not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the claim language requires fewer mapping/conversion tables (page 16). However, the claim language merely requires a certain number of tables without precluding the use of other tables. Therefore, this argument is not persuasive.

Finally, the applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach the second predetermined serialized format being unique to the second document management system and including second document content and second property information.

However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Crozier discloses each handheld device has a unique first predetermined data format. Once this data is translated, via a rules engine, a second predetermined format, a desktop format, is created. This desktop format is unique to the second document management system of the desktop, as the first document management system of the handheld is unable to process the data (column 10, line 66- column 11, line 12). Therefore, this argument is not persuasive.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KYLE R. STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Examiner
Art Unit 2178

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2178

krS